

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/085,464	02/27/2002	Donald W. Crowe JR.	01-4951	1837
7590 . 11/12/2004			EXAMINER	
Edward M. Livingston, Esq.			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
628 Ellen Dr. P.O. Box 1599			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Winter Park, FL 32790			3751	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
<u> </u>	10/085,464	CROWE, DONALD W.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert M. Fetsuga	3751
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOTHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set or extende	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a unication. of days, a reply within the statutory minimum of the utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC will, by statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <u>30 December 2003</u> .	
2a) This action is FINAL .	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition f closed in accordance with the practic		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the at 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6 and 8-20</u> 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	is/are withdrawn from consideration	on.
Application Papers		
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		·
Applicant may not request that any object		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to		ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). ed Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received. documents have been received in of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P' 	TO-948) Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date		f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/085,464

Art Unit: 3751

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 30, 2003 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 6 and 8-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b).
- 3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 5, line 14, "4-8" apparently should be --5-8--.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the "open outer end" and "floor" set forth in claim 1 could not be found in the specification. Applicant is reminded claim terminology in mechanical cases should appear in the descriptive portion of the specification by reference to the drawing(s).

Application/Control Number: 10/085,464 Page 3

Art Unit: 3751

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is unclear as to whether the "toilet bolt head" is intended to be part of the claimed combination since structure of the "flange" is defined as being connected thereto (ln. 17), but no positive structural antecedent basis therefor has been defined.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis, Yavitch and Angelone.

Application/Control Number: 10/085,464

Art Unit: 3751

The DeAngelis reference discloses a toilet flange comprising: an arcuate plate 24 including a bracket (unnumbered, Fig. 4 at top or bottom) having an open outer end/shank opening/bracket entry (at outer perimeter) and an end wall (Fig. 4, hidden lines); and floor bolt apertures (receiving 26). Therefore, DeAngelis teaches all claimed elements except for the bracket including raised side walls and a floor.

Although the bracket of the DeAngelis toilet flange does not include raised side walls, as claimed, attention is directed to the Yavitch reference which discloses an analogous toilet flange which further includes a bracket 44 having raised side walls (connecting 22 and 50). Therefore, in consideration of Yavitch, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate raised side walls with the DeAngelis bracket in order to facilitate installation.

Although the bracket of the DeAngelis toilet flange does not include a floor, as claimed, attention is directed to the Angelone reference which discloses an analogous toilet flange which further includes a bracket (at 13 or 14) having a floor 16,17. Therefore, in consideration of Angelone, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a floor with the DeAngelis bracket in order to prevent bolts from falling through the flange.

Application/Control Number: 10/085,464

Art Unit: 3751

8. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis, Yavitch and Angelone as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Bressler.

Re claim 3, although the DeAngelis fastener plate 24 is not two inches in length, as claimed, attention is directed to the Bressler reference which discloses an analogous fastener plate which further can be less than 180° in extent (col. 3 lns. 42-45). Therefore, in consideration of Bressler, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a shorter length with the DeAngelis fastener plate in order to facilitate repairing a broken closet flange. The choice of specific size would appear an obvious choice to be made depending upon the size of the break, desired strength, etc.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis, Yavitch and Angelone as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Buchanan, Jr.

To the extent the floor bolt apertures of the DeAngelis toilet flange are not "arcuate", as claimed, attention is directed to the Buchanan, Jr. (Buchanan) reference which discloses an analogous toilet flange which further includes elongate floor bolt apertures 2. Therefore, in consideration of Buchanan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3751

the art to associate elongate apertures with the DeAngelis toilet flange in order to facilitate securement.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Kispert reference discloses a toilet flange having features in common with the instant invention.

- 11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 at pages 1112 of the response filed December 30, 2003 have been considered
 but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 703/308-1506 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday.

Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751